

## REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's attention to the present application. This response cancels claims 61-90 and introduces new claims 91-112. Claims 91, 99, and 106 are the independent claims. Reconsideration of the application in view of the enclosed amendments and remarks is requested.

## ARGUMENT

The Final Office Action rejects claims 61-90 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 6,226,749 to Marius Carloganu et al. (hereinafter "Carloganu"), in view of U.S. patent no. 5,684,948 to James S. Johnson et al. (hereinafter "Johnson"). Applicant respectfully asserts that some or all of those rejections are not well founded. Further, Applicant respectfully traverses those rejections to the extent that they might be applied to the present claims.

As indicated in Section 2143 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), one of the basic criteria that must be met to establish *prima facie* case of obviousness is that "the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." (Emphasis added.) However, even if Carloganu and Johnson were to be combined, the combination would not teach or suggest all features recited in any of the independent claims of the present application.

### Information Disclosure Statements

In at least two prior responses, Applicant has pointed out that the Examiner's initials were missing from some of the references in the following Information Disclosure Statements (IDSs): (1) the IDS mailed on January 26, 2004; and (2) the IDS mailed on June 29, 2004. However, Applicant has yet to receive confirmation that the Examiner has considered all references listed in those IDSs. In addition, as pointed out in at least one previous response, an IDS

was submitted on January 13, 2005, but Applicant has not received confirmation that the Examiner has considered the references listed in that IDS.

In a telephone conference on December 2, 2005, the Examiner indicated that she had copies of two of the above IDSs, but perhaps not the IDS submitted January 26, 2004. Therefore, a copy of that IDS is included herewith.

Applicant again requests confirmation that the Examiner has considered all references listed in the three IDSs identified above.

### CONCLUSION

If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (512) 732-3927.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 9, 2005

/ Michael R. Barre /  
Michael R. Barré  
Registration No. 44,023  
Patent Attorney  
Intel Americas, Inc.  
(512) 732-3927

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor &  
Zafman, LLP  
12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026